

1	parties have not filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. As such, the Court will
2	not consider any objections or new evidence.
3	The Court has reviewed the entire record and concludes that Magistrate Judge
4	Marshall's recommendations are not clearly erroneous. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R.
5	Civ. P. 72; Johnson v. Zema Systems Corp., 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999); Conley v.
6	Crabtree, 14 F. Supp. 2d 1203, 1204 (D. Or. 1998).
7	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:
8	(1) United States Magistrate Judge Marshall's Report and Recommendation (Doc. #22) is
9	ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED.
10	(2) Defendant's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #14) is <b>DENIED</b> .
11	(3) Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #12) is <b>GRANTED</b> , and this case is
12	REMANDED TO THE ALJ for reconsideration consistent with the Report and
13	Recommendation.
14	(4) The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close the file
15	in this matter.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	DATED this 4 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2006.
22	
23	Curicy K. Josenson
24	Cindy K. Jorgenson
25	United States District Judge
26	

Case 4:04-cv-00657-CKJ-JR Document 23 Filed 05/05/06 Page 2 of 2

27

28